



ICRC No.: HOra14090733 HUD No.: 05-14-1610-8

JAMAL L. SMITH, in his official capacity as EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR of the INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, Complainant,

٧.

GARDEN CITY TRAILOR PARK/ JIM BOHUNSKY, Respondent.

## NOTICE OF FINDING and ISSUANCE OF CHARGE

The Executive Director of the Indiana Civil Rights Commission ("Commission"), pursuant to statutory authority and procedural regulations, hereby issues the following findings with respect to the above-referenced case. Reasonable cause exists to believe that an unlawful discriminatory practice occurred in this instance. A Charge is therefore issued in accordance with 910 IAC 2-6-6(b).

On September 17, 2014, filed a Complaint with the Commission against Garden City Park/Jim Bohunsky owner ("Respondent") alleging discrimination on the basis of race by association in violation of the Indiana Fair Housing Act (Ind. Code § 22-9.5, et seq.,) the Indiana Civil Rights Law (Ind. Code § 22-9, et seq.,) and Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 3601, et seq.) Accordingly, the Commission has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this Complaint.

An investigation has been completed. Both parties have had an opportunity to submit evidence. Based on the final investigative report and a review of the relevant files and records, the Executive Director now finds the following:

The first issue before the Commission is whether Respondent refused to rent a lot to Complainant because of his association with an individual of another race. In order to prevail on such a claim, Complainant must show that: 1) he is associated with an individual of another race; 2) he was qualified to rent in accordance with Respondent's reasonable terms and conditions; 3) he made a bona fide offer to rent a site from Respondent; 4) Respondent refused Complainant's offer to rent; and 5) evidence exists to raise a presumption of unlawful discrimination based on this association. There is sufficient evidence to believe that



Respondent refused to rent to Complainant because he had a bi-racial girlfriend.

By way of background, Complainant is dating, a b	i-racial (African-American and
Caucasian) female. On or about August 20, 2014,	called Respondent to inquire
about renting a mobile home. Evidence shows that Respondent	
month including utilities. Although is employed, evid	dence shows that Respondent
told Complainant that she needed "two people to pay rent" or	"a man" to help and was not
interested in renting to her. Later, on or about August 28, 2014, 0	Complainant, , their
daughter, Complainant's sister, and the sister's boyfriend visit	
inquire about renting a mobile home for Complainant,	
however, during the course of the visit, Respondent pointed to	
that?" Respondent then inquired about race. Evide	•
that Complainant was bi-racial (African-American and Caucasian,)	Respondent said that "we do
not accept that race here" and refused to rent to Complainant.	
Despite Respondent's assertions, there is insufficient evidence the evidence shows that Respondent denied Complainant's offer the Complainant's girlfriend was African-American and Caucasian. When does not recall speaking to and opined that opportunity to rent because lacked sufficient incomplainanty to rent because lacked sufficient incomplainant, Respondent admits that he does not have paper approached policy requiring his renters to have a job or "some form them to rent. As evidence suggests that Complainant's bona for the because of his association with his bi-racial girlfriend, reasonable discriminatory practice occurred as alleged.	o rent once he noticed that While Respondent alleges that he denied Complainant the ne, evidence shows that ary to rent from Respondent. Oplications and that he has a of income" before permitting tide offer to rent was denied
The second issue before the Commission is whether Responde	ent subjected Complainant to
discriminatory statements. As mentioned above, Complainant	
Complainant's sister, and the sister's boyfriend were present at th	
, asked "what was that," and stated that he did	not "accept that race here."
Moreover, witness testimony asserts Respondent stated a similar	ly discriminatory statement of
"we do not allow that in here" when referring to	• •
that Respondent made a discriminatory statement demonstrating	
a particular race. As such and based upon the aforementione	d, <u>reasonable cause exists</u> to
believe that a discriminatory practice occurred as alleged.	

A public hearing is necessary to determine whether a violation of the Indiana Fair Housing Act, the Indiana Civil Rights Law, and/or Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended, occurred in the aforementioned case. As permitted by 910 IAC 2-6-6(h), Respondent, Complainant, or an aggrieved person on whose behalf the Complaint is filed may elect to have the claims asserted in a civil action under Ind. Code § 22-9.5-6-12 in lieu of an administrative proceeding under 910 IAC 2-7. In the event the parties seek to pursue such an election, it must be made not later than twenty

<u>January</u>	12,	2015

Date

Jamal L. Smith Executive Director Indiana Civil Rights Commission